



75¢

EX-PRIEST ANSWERS

ATTACK BY ROMAN CLERGY

AN ANSWER TO
THE CRITICISM OF MY LECTURES
BY

Dr. Peter J. Doeswyck

KNIGHTS OF CHRIST
Box 1651
Long Beach, California

1956

Copyright by Peter J. Doeswyck

1956

Printed in the United States of America

THE AUTHOR AND THE BOOKLET

DR. PETER J. DOESWYCK, a convert from the Roman Catholic Priesthood, needs no introduction to Protestants. For many years he has lectured in Protestant churches, city auditoriums and over the radio. As a student of the Scriptures and of Patrology, he usually speaks on the history of various doctrines.

As the Knights of Columbus are using our daily newspapers for religious controversies, a Protestant certainly has the right to defend his faith within the four walls of a Protestant church.

For months and years the priests of the Diocese of La Crosse, Wisc., and others have been taking notes of Dr. Doeswyck's lectures and have come out with "A Reply," edited and mimeographed by the Serra Club of Eau Claire, Wisc. This booklet is an answer to their criticism.

Dr. Doeswyck would rather have published his lectures, or his many manuscripts on the origin of Roman Catholic doctrine and practices, than an answer to a criticism of certain parts of his lectures. However, as the Catholic Reply not only attacks his character, but also that of some of the most prominent ministers who have sponsored him, he thought it necessary to answer the charges for the sake of all concerned.

Knights of Christ, Inc.
Box 1651
Long Beach, Calif.

C O N T E N T S

	page
Introduction	3
Indulgences	4
Penance	8
Apocrypha	12
Sale of Masses.....	16
Extreme Unction.....	18
Purgatory	18
Bible a Forbidden Book.....	21
Mariology	21
Jesuits vs. Dominicans.....	22
Eastern Rites.....	23
Transubstantiation	26
Kissing of Pope's Feet.....	28
Papal Tiara.....	28
Bible vs. Rome.....	29
Misquotations and Distortions.....	29
Ordination of Women.....	30
Novenas	30
Blessed Medals.....	31
Blessed Scapulars.....	32
Rosary	34
Immaculate Conception.....	34
Assumption of Mary.....	37
Roman Church and Roman Primacy.....	38
Papal Infallibility.....	41
Conclusion	42
Bibliography	43

In Jesus' name

The much advertised "Reply" by the priests of the La Crosse Diocese to my lectures in Eau Claire, La Crosse, and elsewhere, is very disappointing, to say the least. Nearly every page of the 50 page attack is filled with such words as "liar," "malicious lies," "pack of lies," "deliberate lie," etc., and endeavors to destroy confidence of the reader as to the veracity of my statements by constantly questioning my study of the Fathers (p. 20f.).

I have spoken in hundreds of churches of all denominations, including Methodist, and the contents of my lectures are public knowledge. Yet the Roman hierarchy, hiding behind the name of "Serra Club," conjectures: "It is possible that had he spoken in a Methodist Church he would have had little good to say of Lutheranism" (p.3).

I mentioned that hundreds of priests have been converted and are now pastors of Protestant churches. I gave several instances, beginning with Rev. Fredette of Nora Springs, Ia. The "Reply" comments: "There are three reasons and three reasons only why a priest abandons his state: blondes, brunettes and red heads" (p.47). Such statements make it difficult for me to believe that the Reply is sincere. Rev. Fredette, the first ex-priest I mentioned, is still single and so are dozens of others. The Reply attempts to convey the idea that Protestantism or Evangelical Christianity is so ridiculous that no priest in his right mind could ever be converted to it.

The "Reply" also laments on more than one occasion that the speaker did not give an opportunity to the Roman clergy to question his statements (pp. 2, 14). This is supposed to imply that I am afraid to face the intelligentsia of the La Crosse Diocese. I have spoken almost daily for the last 8 years and have always and everywhere allowed question periods. Because the La Crosse Diocese, instead of sending Seminary professors to my meetings, resorted to allowing hoodlums, prize-fighters and roughnecks to follow my meetings and to misuse my question periods by disturbing the peace and dignity of our services, no question period was announced at Eau Claire.

The Reply also charges "that not a single statement was backed up with a shred of evidence" (p.3). Naturally one

cannot hold an audience for an hour and a half with endless quotations of the Fathers. The Reply even criticizes me for wanting to sound learned by using the word "filioque". How would it sound if I constantly spoke of "Mansi" and "Migne", and quoted volumes and pages?

The complaint that I did not give the clergy an opportunity for questions sounds to me like an invitation to return. I shall be back and will invite every priest, professor, monsignor and bishop of the La Crosse area. Questions will be limited to the clergy only. The Press will be invited.

It is impossible to answer in writing all charges of the "Reply" without creating a work of several volumes. When time or space do not permit full documentation, I rather omit any reference. I have written several manuscripts which could serve as ready answers to and conclusive refutation of any and all charges, but unfortunately publishers do not like to print material which bookstores may turn down under Roman Catholic pressure. I shall, therefore, select a few subjects which I shall treat here more fully, while other subjects will have to be answered by a few lines to the best of my ability.

I N D U L G E N C E S

The La Crosse Diocese promised to prove "conclusively" that my assertion that Indulgences were unknown during the first thousand years of christianity is "entirely false" (*Reply*, p. 17) and produces two biblical texts (p. 36) which have no bearing on the subject. The text of II Samuel 12:14 is supposed to prove that there is a distinction between the *guilt* (*culpa*) of sin and the *punishment* (*poena*) of sin; the text of Matthew 16:19 is supposed to prove that the Lord bestowed on the bishop of Rome the power to grant indulgences.

During the first thousand years of christianity nearly one hundred Fathers and Doctors of the Church Universal interpreted these two texts, but not one gives the interpretation of the La Crosse Diocese.

Hugo of St. Victor (d. 1141) is the first theologian to invent the distinction between *culpa et poena*. He uses his invention,

not for the purpose of proving the power of granting indulgences, but in an attempt to unify two opposing schools of thought, one maintaining that sins are to be confessed to God, the other maintaining that sins cannot be forgiven without confession to a priest. Hugo ventured that God deals with the guilt of sin, the priest with the punishment (*Hugo, "On the Sacraments," Book 2, part 14, chapt. 8; Migne, P.L., vol. 176, p. 364f*).

After the Schoolmen invented the "Treasury of the Church," the distinction between guilt and punishment was gradually applied to the doctrines of Purgatory and Indulgences.

The Universal Church, up to the final schism of 1054, granted no indulgences. The first indulgence is that of the Council of Clermont (1095). The "pardon" granted in 1095 was not a pardon from the punishment of purgatory, but only a "redemption" or pardon in the matter of Public Penance, reconciling the excommunicated penitent with his church. The Church then could only loosen what it could bind. A Protestant Church may excommunicate a member for a public crime, and reinstate the same after due proof of repentance, without claiming the power of forgiving sins or granting indulgences.

"According to the decree of the Council of Clermont (1095) those who joined a crusade were freed from all obligation in the matter of penance" (*Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 11, p. 632*). The more discouraging the crusades became, the greater favors the popes had to promise in order to find new dupes to enlist. Pope Nicholas IV in 1291 not only promised full pardon to the crusaders, but also included their parents. At first one could gain a plenary indulgence (full pardon) only by actually participating in a crusade. Later the pardon was granted at the moment one took the vow to join the crusade. Still later one could be released from the vow by paying the price of a soldier. Finally one could obtain full pardon by paying a flat sum without taking the vow and without ever joining a crusade. By the 15th century "Pope John XXIII SOLD for cash money: INDULGENCES for the dying, the preaching of the Cross, and also absolution FROM PUNISHMENT AND FROM GUILT (a poena et a culpa); concessions of church-altars and portable altars, and consecrations of Bishops, and the ordinations of Abbots; relics of the Saints, Sacred Orders, the power to absolve from sins in confessions, and other acts which only through the working of the

Holy Ghost gratuitously must be administered" (*Minutes of the Council of Constance in 1415, Session 10, Art. 29; Mansi, vol. 27, p. 666*).

Any scholar of patrology and of the councils knows that indulgences did not exist during the first millenium of christianity. They were not instituted by Christ, but occasioned by the Turks. As it is difficult to prove the non-existence of a doctrine, I do not blame those who do not know the Fathers for not believing me. But the priests of the La Crosse Diocese ought to believe their own scholars and Saints. Saint Antoninus, for example, a great scholar and author, Archbishop of Florence, Italy, and host to the Bishops of the Council of Florence (1439), writes: "We have no testimony in the Scriptures, nor among the Fathers, in favor of Indulgences, but only the authority of some modern authors" (*Antoninus. Summa Theol. Mor. I. 3*). I merely repeated what their own Saints are saying. If I am a "liar", it necessarily follows that the Saints, before whose statues they kneel and pray, are liars too. But is it at all scholarly to call anyone a "liar" just because he told you something you did not know?

"Let God be true, but every man a liar" (*Rom. 3:4*). They should at least believe God who says: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith" (*Rom. 3:28*), "his faith is counted for righteousness" (*Rom. 4:5*), "blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin" (*Rom. 4:7-8*), "therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God" (*Rom. 5:1*), "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (*Rom. 8:1*), "their sins and iniquities will I remember no more" (*Heb. 10:17*).

When God promises that He will cover the sins of the believers and will forget them completely, how could He punish the same for hundreds of years in purgatory? We know that the thief on the cross went into immediate glory because of his faith in Christ (*Luke 23:43*). The same reward is promised to all believers.

As Roman Catholics are not allowed to believe my interpretation of the Bible, and as no bishop of Rome nor any priest of the Diocese of La Crosse has ever written a commentary on the Bible, we must go back to the Fathers and Saints of the

Church who have explained these texts. For brevity's sake we shall select the greatest of all Fathers, St. John Chrysostom.

John Chrysostom (347-407), Saint, Patriarch of Constantinople, is the greatest of all Fathers. His works alone occupy 18 huge volumes of small print in Migne's Patrology. His statue, along with those of St. Augustine, Athanasius and Ambrose, supports the papal throne in the St. Peter's Church of Rome. His works are an encyclopedia in itself. He interpreted every book of the Bible. He wrote books on "Repentance", on the "Priesthood" and every subject related to christianity.

In John's day, paganism had its priests and human mediators who for a price absolved (loosened) the sins of their fellowmen and imposed penances and satisfactions on those who confessed their sins to them. John Chrysostom, in his book "On Repentance", warns his readers that a Christian should not imitate these pagan practices, but should confess his sins to God, because the tears of repentance and the contrition of the heart are all that is required for the remission of sins; nor does there remain any punishment due to sins which are to be expiated by penances and satisfactions:

"However, there is nothing like this with God, for He is ready to receive us without a mediator (*sine intercessore*), He grants our petition without a price or charge (*sine pecuniis, sine sumptibus*): ALL THAT IS NEEDED is to cry out with the heart alone (*sufficit solo corde clamare*) and to offer our tears" (*Chrysostom, "On Repentance," Homily 4, paragr. 4; Migne, P. G., vol. 49, p. 304*). Commenting on the Thief of the Cross, St. John Chrysostom writes:

"And the Saviour saith: 'This day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise' (*Luke 23:41*). He did not say: 'I loose thee by means of punishment and satisfaction,' but He leads him into Paradise as one made *RIGHTEOUS*. Did you notice the righteous effect of this kind of confession? . . . Listen carefully: In such a manner does He destroy sin, that not the slightest trace of them is left" (*Chrysostom, "On Repentance," Homily 2, paragraph 2; Migne, P. G., vol 49, p. 339*).

Before the priests of the La Crosse Diocese begin to yell "liar" at this great Saint, and call him an anti-Catholic "Doctor", they ought to remove his statue from the St. Peter's Church.

If God destroys the sins of the believer in such a way that

there remains not the slightest trace of "poena", it follows that all Masses and Indulgences for the souls in Purgatory are in vain.

I wonder what Saint Chrysostom thinks of the advertisements in our national Catholic newspapers:

"ARE YOU INSURED ?

Write and ask about our plan to offer

Gregorian Masses after your death.

THIS IS REAL INSURANCE FOR YOUR SOUL."

(*Our Sunday Visitor, Huntington, Ind., Aug. 11, 1946*)

"Enroll yourself or loved ones

IN THE SACRED HEART MASS LEAGUE...

MASS SAID DAILY TO THE END OF TIME...

WRITE TO FATHER SUPERIOR

Sacred Heart Mission House, Sainte Marie, Illinois."

(*The "Register", Oct. 3, 1948*)

SACRAMENT OF PENANCE

Speaking of John Chrysostom, the Catholic Encyclopedia pretends to be surprised "that he seems to ignore private confession to a priest" (*C.E., vol. 8, p. 457*). I have before me a manuscript which I compiled from the Fathers who interpreted Matthew 16:19 and John 20:23. Not one of them knew of a Sacrament of Penance. Beginning with Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Jerome, they vigorously condemn the modern Roman interpretation of these texts.

The first Public Penitential system, lasting till the eighth century, was purely disciplinary. The second Penitential system introduced voluntary confession to a priest. Naturally the question arose whether oral confession was essential or merely recommended. The Western theologians were divided by two schools of thought and remained divided till the thirteenth century.

The first council to mention this disunity within the Western Church is the Second Council of Chalons (9th cent.). This Council, though opposed to the new Anglo-Saxon system, did not wish to offend either school and diplomatically ruled:

"Some say that they ought to confess their sins to God alone, and some think they are to be confessed to the priests, both of which are practised in the Holy Church not without great fruit" (*II Council of Chalons, Canon 33; Mansi, Sac. Concil., vol. 14, p. 100*). Hence by the ninth century the Protestant way of confessing sins directly to God was still practised in the Western Church "not without great fruit." The Bible never mentions confession to a priest. It does not even speak of a mediatory priesthood of the N.T. Church. The priests of the Old Testament did not claim the power of forgiving sins (Luke 5:21). As the New Testament is "a better covenant" (*Heb. 8:6*), it naturally follows that remission of sins remained the prerogative of God alone. Only those who preach the Gospel and the Baptism of repentance are indirectly instrumental in the salvation of souls, and in the remission or retention of sins (*Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:16; Luke 24:47; John 20:23; Acts 1:8; Acts 2:38*). By the ninth century we find two theological schools, one upholding the biblical way of salvation, the other introducing the Anglo-Saxon penitential system. "Our modern declarative form of absolution," explains the Catholic Encyclopedia, "is probably of Anglo-Saxon origin" (*C.E. vol. 1, p. 509*).

The Anglo-Saxon penitential system did not become a "sacrament" till the twelfth century. Bishop Gregory of Bergamo (12th cent.; see *Conway, Question Box, p. 234*), an Italian scholar, is the first to arrive at the number of "seven" sacraments. Instead of Penance and Extreme Unction, he lists the Sacrament of the Bible and the Sacrament of the Oath. Penance is not even listed among the "minor" sacraments (*Gregory of Bergamo, "Treatise on the true body of Christ," chapt. 14; Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula, vol. 39, p. 58*).

Peter Abelard (d. 1142) in his famous book "*Sic et Non*" exposes for the first time that the Fathers of the Church differ in doctrine far more than all fundamental Protestant churches of today. Under Question 151: "Whether sins are not remitted without confession?" he lists the Fathers who taught that the contrition of the heart alone was sufficient, and those who seem to stress confession to a priest. He leaves the question wide open (*Abelard, "Sic et Non," Quest. 151; Migne, P.L., vol. 178, p. 1599*).

John Gratian (c. 1150), Italian scholar and greatest Canonist

Rome ever produced, touches the same subject in his famous "Treatise on Penance" (*John Gratian*, "*Decretum*," *pars 2, causa 35, quaestio 3*; *Migne, P.L.*, vol. 187, p. 1519). He reveals that by the middle of the 12th century half of the Western Church still believed in the biblical way of salvation and opposed the Anglo-Saxon way. Rome condemned neither school.

Gratian starts out with the old school which maintains that ANY SIN (*quemlibet criminis veniam*) can be forgiven THROUGH CONTRITION OF THE HEART ALONE (*sola cordis contritione*), WITHOUT AN ORAL CONFESSION TO A PRIEST (*absque oris confessione*). He lists a great number of Fathers who support this school and also quotes the sources which seem to support the second school. Without deciding the question, and impartially presenting both views, Gratian concludes:

"I have briefly stated upon what authorities or upon what strength of reason both opinions are based. Which of them we should rather cleave to is left to the judgment of the reader, for both have as their supporters wise and religious men" (*John Gratian, De Poenitentia, Dist. 1, 89; Migne, P.L.*, vol. 187, p. 1562).

The French theologians, Peter Lombard (d. 1164; "*Sentences*," *Bk. 4, Dist. 17; Migne, P.L.*, vol. 192, p. 880) and Hugo of St. Victor (d. 1141; "*On the sacraments*," *bk. 2, part 14, chapt. 8; Migne, P.L.*, vol. 176, p. 364) hesitatingly began to teach that oral confession to a priest was essential to obtaining remission of sins. The Italian scholars finally accepted the French view, and in 1215 the Fourth Lateran Council made the confession of sins to a priest obligatory. After four centuries of controversy the Mithraistic-Anglo-Saxon Penitential system supplanted the evangelical way of salvation, and Roman Catholicism was born. The scholars of the Catholic Encyclopedia are not allowed to confess these historical facts, but hiding behind the opinions of Protestant scholars they confess the same: "Calvin . . . attributed its origin to the Fourth Latern Council (1215). At that time, according to Lea (I, 228) the necessity of confession 'became a new article of faith'" (*C.E.*, vol. 11, p. 626).

When we know that Pope Siricius (d. 399) decreed: "No clergyman is ever allowed to do penance," *Clerico nullo conceditur poenitentiam agere* (*Siricius, Ep. 1, 18; Migne, P.L.* vol. 13, p. 1118), and that Pope Leo (d. 461) decreed that Baptism

may be postponed, even till death (*Leo, Ep. 16:5; Migne, P.L., vol. 54, p. 701*), we know for certain that the early Church of Rome regarded Penance to be purely disciplinary and not sacramental.

Remission text of John 20:23

Under "Private Interpretation," the Reply states: "When the Bible says: 'Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them', the CHURCH accepts those words literally" (*Reply, p. 10*).

The Reply fails to state which church and when. In the 3rd century the Roman church, like the African Councils and St. Cyprian (*Ep. 75:11; Migne, P.L., 3, 1193*), taught that the remission text refers to the preaching of the baptism of repentance. "After this we also entreat for our sins when we say: And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors" (*Migne, P.L., 4, 552*). "The Lord alone can pardon. He alone can grant forgiveness of sins" (*Cyprian, On the Lapsed, 17; Migne, P.L. 4, 479*). No human being can grant pardon: "What the Lord did not even grant to His Apostles," *quod nec Apostolis concessit Dominus* (*Cyprian, Ep. 51, chapt. 25; Migne, P.L. 3, 816*).

In the fifth century the African church explained that John 20:23 means that all sins are forgiven by faith in Jesus Christ and love of each other (*Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, Bk. 1, chapt. 18; Migne, P.L. 34, 25*).

In the eighth century the Church of England still followed the same interpretation (*Bede, Comment. on John 20:23; Migne, P.L. 92, 921*).

But today, when a Roman bishop ordains a priest, he says: Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, etc. However the remission text of the Rite of priestly ordination is not found in any ritual prior to the 12th century, when the sacrament of Penance originated. The remission text is wanting in all Sacramentaries. It was unknown to Amalarius of Metz, Rabanus of Mainz, Ives of Chartres, Hugo of St. Victor, and to all the great liturgists and canonists who wrote on the subject prior to the 12th century. Without the official approval of an Ecumenical Council or Papal Bull, this priestly power of forgiving sins was sneaked into the local rituals of Western Europe during the 12th and 13th centuries, and not officially approved

by Rome till the 16th century.

A P O C R Y P H A

The Diocese of La Crosse in its "Reply" maintains that "In the Bible as used by Protestants SEVEN COMPLETE BOOKS OF THE CATHOLIC BIBLE are missing...seven fewer than in EVERY COLLECTION AND CATALOG OF HOLY SCRIPTURE FROM THE FOURTH TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. These were DELIBERATELY cut out" (p. 10). "Luther among others poured contempt and doubt upon some of the inspired writings which had been acknowledged and cherished and venerated for 1000 and 1200 years... whenever any book such as the Book of the Maccabees taught a doctrine that was repugnant to his individual taste—as for example 'It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins' (II Macc. 12:46)—well, so much the worse for the book" (*Reply*, p. 13).

I have before me a lengthy manuscript which I compiled some years ago, listing and quoting in full every Father of the Church who has written on the canon of the Bible. Not one of the Greek Fathers, and not one of the Latin Fathers (the disputed Augustine included) taught that the Second Book of Maccabees was inspired. Besides, II Machabees 12:46 does not refer to Purgatory, as Rome maintains today.

There is a great difference between "prayers for the dead" and "purgatory." The Greek Orthodox Church believes in the first, but not in the latter. Purgatory is supposed to be for those who die in venial sin, and it will cease to exist after the day of resurrection. The sacrifices for sin, brought by Judas, were for soldiers who had been caught in an act of mortal sin and were struck dead by God Himself (*II Macc. 12:40*). Their prayers were not to benefit the dead till the Day of Resurrection (*II Macc. 12:43*). The author of this book is an Egyptian, Greek-speaking Pharisee who had become influenced by Egyptian mythology. The Books of Moses do not mention such sacrifices. Second Maccabees was not written till 165 B.C. when the Hebrew Canon had been closed for centuries.

The Apocrypha supposedly belong to the Old Testament

or the Hebrew Bible. Neither the Palestinian Jews in the days of Christ (*Josephus, "Against Apion," Bk I, paragr. 8*), nor the Jews of today include these books in their Hebrew Bible.

Space permits me to mention only the most important Fathers: St. Melito (c. 170), the first Christian to draw up a list of all canonical books, rejects the Apocrypha (*Migne, P.G., vol. 20, p. 398*). Origen (c. 248), the first Father of the Church to write a commentary on the Bible, rejects the Apocrypha (*Migne, P.G. 20, 582*). Eusebius, first Christian to write a History of the Church, rejects the Apocrypha (*Migne, P.G. 20, 582*). The Council of Laodicea (4th century), the first council to speak of the Canon of the Bible, not only rejected the Apocrypha, but forbade their reading in the churches (*Laodicea, canon 60; Mansi, S. Concil., vol. 2, p. 573*). The Codex Vaticanus (c. 370), the oldest Septuagint copy in existence and the property of the Vatican, does not have the Books of Maccabees. St. Jerome (c. 400) at the request of the Bishop of Rome translated the Bible into Latin and gave the Roman Church its first 'official' Bible, the Vulgate. Jerome translated also the apocryphal books of the Septuagint, but warned his readers that these books were not inspired and may not be used for the purpose of establishing christian doctrine (*Migne, P.L., vol. 28, p. 83*). "St. Jerome," says the Catholic Encyclopedia, "cast his weighty suffrage on the side unfavourable to the disputed books" (*C.E. 3, 272*); and Father Conway comments: "the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, influenced by St. Jerome, denied the canonicity of the deuterocanonical books" (*Question Box, p. 63*). If "the Church," as the priests of La Crosse maintain, pronounced the apocrypha inspired (A.D. 393, 397 and 419), how come that all Fathers of that era pronounced them non-canonical?

Throughout the Middle Ages the official Latin Vulgate warned its readers that the Apocrypha, although included for pious reading, were not inspired. Father Migne has reprinted a ninth century copy of the Vulgate which still carries St. Jerome's warnings in its prefaces (*Migne, P.L., vol. 29*). The text of this late Bible also exposes the falsifications of the modern Vulgate, e.g., Gen. 3:15 still reads: "He (ipse) shall crush thy head" (*Migne, P.L., 28, 200*).

Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604) used the Vulgate, and when

he quoted in one of his sermons a passage from the First Book of Maccabees, he apologized for using non-canonical material (*Migne, P.L., vol. 76, p. 119*). Hugo of St. Victor (c. 1135), the first 'Roman Catholic' theologian, warns that the Apocrypha are not inspired (*Migne, P.L. vol. 175, p. 15*). Down to the Reformation, Roman Catholic theologians warned that the Apocrypha were not canonical. For example Cardinal Ximenez (d. 1517), Franciscan scholar and Primate of Spain, and Cardinal Cajetan (d. 1534), world famous Italian Dominican scholar, denied the canonicity of the Apocrypha.

We see, therefore, that the actual history of the Apocrypha is just the opposite of what the priests of La Crosse are saying. Martin Luther did not reject the Second Book of Maccabees for the reasons they give, but shared the common opinion of the Roman Catholic scholars of his day. When the Reformers translated the Bible into the vernacular and also translated the Apocrypha for pious reading, they merely followed St. Jerome in warning their readers that these additional books of the Septuagint were not inspired.

The Council of Trent, April 8, 1546 (the year Luther died). in its 4th Session, anxious to oppose any Protestant belief, did not hesitate to contradict 1500 years of tradition and pronounced under pain of excommunication that the Apocrypha were inspired. The Council of Trent lasted 18 years and few bishops could afford to attend its sessions. A handful of attendants, almost without any study or discussion, nearly 1200 years after the Council of Laodicea, felt qualified to reverse the universal teaching of the church, and increased the number of books of the Old Testament, thinking that with the aid of them they could prove the existence of their late invented Purgatory.

I have personally studied every Father of the Church on this subject. My conclusion is just the opposite of what the priests of La Crosse are telling. Who is misinformed or ignorant of the subject? The scholars of the Catholic Encyclopedia will give the answer:

"The ancient Greek Old Testament, known as the Septuagint, was the vehicle which conveyed these additional Scriptures into the Catholic Church . . . In the Latin Church, all through the Middle Ages we find hesitation about the character of the deuterio-canonicals . . . FEW are found to unequivocally ac-

knowledge their canonicity" (*Cath. Enc.*, vol. 3, pp. 270, 273).

Maybe the scholars of this Roman Catholic encyclopedia are "liars" too. Let us not forget that the Encyclopedia carries the official *imprimatur*, but the Reply by the priests of La Crosse does not.

What about Augustine and the African Councils? The silence of the Fathers and the Popes about these sources is proof enough that the African texts have been interpolated. Augustine's "City of God," Bk. 18, chapt. 36 is most clearly interpolated (*Migne*, P.L. 41, 596). In his "Christian Doctrine," Bk. 2, chapt. 8, Augustine lists all the books of the Septuagint, canonical and ecclesiastical, and clearly brings out that no African Council had ever settled the Canon of the Scriptures (*Migne*, P.L. 34, 40).

Even if the canons of the extinct African Church had not been falsified, their decisions were not infallible. The Council of Carthage, A.D. 419, which supposedly canonized the Apocrypha during the days of St. Jerome, was neither "Roman" nor "Ecumenical."

The same Council of Carthage, 419, which in canon 29 (or in canon 24, or in canon 27; all MSS read differently) include the Apocrypha, also decreed: (1) that no Presbyter may reconcile anyone to communion (*canon 6 and 43; Mansi, S. Concil.*, vol. 4, p. 424f); (2) that Bishops may have wives and children (*canons 15, 25, 35, 36; Mansi 4, 427f*); (3) that Rome may not interfere with the affairs of the African Church (*canon 28; Mansi 4, 429*); (4) that no bishop may call himself Supreme Pontiff (*canon 39*); (5) that Africa ought to create peace between the Sees of Rome and Alexandria (*canon 101*); (6) that anyone of the African clergy who appeals to Rome is *ipso facto* excommunicated and defrocked (*canons 105, 125; 134; canon 34 in Mansi, vol. 4, p. 431*); (7) that there is not such a place as a Limbo for unbaptized babies (*canon 110*); (8) that without the grace of God we cannot do good works (*canon 113*); (9) that all men are sinners and that God alone can forgive sins (*canon 114*); (10) that Pope Zosimus falsified the canons of the First Ecumenical Council of Nice in order to obtain jurisdiction over the Latin Province of Africa (*canon 134*); (11) that Pope Celestine has no jurisdiction whatsoever over the African Church (*canon 138; Mansi, S. Concil.*, vol. 4, p. 515).

According to the priests of La Crosse, these are the canons of "the Church." The African Church has been overrun by the Goths and Vandals and is now extinct. Most of her records have been lost. If Rome for political reasons, as the African Council claims, did not hesitate to falsify the canons of an Ecumenical Council of the Church Universal, when Rome stands convicted by her own scholars of having falsified hundreds of documents and even of having fabricated canons of councils which never existed (False Decretals, Donation of Constantine, etc.), what makes one think that Rome was afraid to mutilate the canons of an extinct church?

In any case, the Roman Church, both before and after 419, rejected the Apocrypha.

S A L E O F M A S S E S

"The Story of the Mass," a book written by James C. Conniff and carrying the *imprimatur* of Cardinal Spellman, concludes the description of the Mass with the words: "Mass is over. Christ once more is crucified for us."

The Bible teaches: "Nor that He should offer Himself OFTEN . . . So Christ was ONCE offered to bear the sins" (*Heb.* 9: 25-28). "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin" (*Heb.* 10: 18 and 26).

Father Conway antedates the sale of Masses by 4 centuries by using the word "alms" instead of "stipend." Whether 8th or 12th century, its origin is medieval and not biblical: "The practice of giving the priest a money alms for the Mass dates from the seventh or eighth century, and became a universal practice in the twelfth" (*Conway, Question Box*, p. 271; *C.E.* 10, 21).

In the 7th century there was no Mass, but SPIRITUAL SACRIFICES or gifts *in natura*, called Offertory, which have been replaced by collection plates (See: I Peter 2:5; Fortescue, *The Mass*, p. 300; *C.E.* 10, 11). Some French Bishops in the 7th century began to collect "alms" from those who wished to receive the Lord's Supper or who wished to be remembered in prayer. This form of simony was immediately condemned by

Pope Gregory the Great: "The perpetration of the sins of simoniacal heresy, UNDER PRETENSE OF ALMS, is to be totally avoided" (*Gregory I, Bk. 9, Ep. 106; Migne, P.L., vol. 77, p. 1030*).

Not only the Bishop of Rome, but council after council forbade the practice: "That no one, whether Bishop, Presbyter or Deacon, when giving the immaculate Communion, shall exact from him who communicates stipends of any kind. For grace is not to be sold, nor do we impart the sanctification of the Holy Spirit for money, . . . the sin of Simon" (*Council in Trullo, 692, canon 23; Mansi, 11, 954*).

France was first to accept the doctrine of transubstantiation (12th cent.) and first to sell the Mass as a sacrifice for sin. Peter Abelard and Peter Cantor, both French theologians, immediately attacked the new custom. Peter Cantor (d. 1197), a personal friend of Pope Celestine, calls the priests "worse than Judas" ("turpius quam Judas"), because they are "selling Christ" (*Peter Cantor, Abbreviated Text, chap. 27; Migne, P.L., vol. 205, p. 99*).

In the 13th century Thomas Aquinas is the first Roman Catholic theologian to approve the sale of Masses (*Summa II, Qu. 100, Art. 2*), and Rome finally approved the 'simoniacal heresy' by Canon Law (*Canon 824*). Today each Diocese has its own price-list.

Anyone acquainted with "Purgatorial Societies," "Gregorian Masses," or "Mass Foundations," knows that Masses are advertised and sold by the hundreds. If one has the price, one can order Masses for all eternity: "Mass-foundations," explains the Catholic Encyclopedia, "are fixed bequests of funds or real property, the interest or income from which is to procure FOR EVER the celebration of Mass for the founder" (*C.E. vol. 10, p. 21*).

In one point of their accusations the priests of La Crosse may be correct, but they refused to tell the whole story. When my father passed away in Europe, my brother, a European priest of good standing, informed me that my father left in his will \$10,000 for Masses. Though I demanded a copy of this will, I was never able to receive one. Just recently the estate was settled and the attorney confessed that there was no will. The expenses listed for the funeral services (excluding the undertaker) and for Masses was still above \$2,000 (without my

consent). In my talks I merely repeated what a priest "in good standing" had written to me. I will no longer mention the incident, but every priest knows such practices are common and according to canon law.

To compare the sale of masses with Protestant offerings is apparently an act of desperation. A free-will offering is not related to salvation. "You have been saved by grace through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is a gift of God" (Eph. 2:8).

When priests began to be paid for "crucifying Christ," they wanted to say Mass every day. This not only led to Daily Masses, but to abbreviated Masses or Low Masses, and by the 13th century the first "Missals" were composed, and standardized after the Reformation (1570).

"Concelebration was in the early Middle Ages replaced by separate private celebrations. No doubt the custom of offering each Mass for a special intention helped to bring about this CHANGE... The custom of the intention further led to Mass being said every day by each priest" (*Cath. Enc.*, vol. 9, p. 797).

"Low Mass might lead people to think it is the primitive form; on the contrary, it is a late abridgement . . . Low Mass became necessary when celebrations were so multiplied that every priest said Mass once a day . . . It was Low Mass that caused the compilation of missals . . . From the 13th century it (*the Missal*) rapidly becomes the only book used" (*Father Fortescue, The Mass*, p. 185-190).

EXTREME UNCTION

Extreme Unction is not a prayer of faith for "any sick," but a Western Sacrament for the "dying only." It was still unknown to Bishop Gregory of Bergamo (12th cent.), but in the 13th century this new sacrament was made "accessible only to the rich" (*Cath. Enc.*, vol. 5, p. 717).

PURGATORY

The name "Purgatory" (*Purgatorium*), a place distinct from Heaven and Hell, appears for the first time in the 13th century.

Pope Innocent IV invented it, Thomas Aquinas expounded it, but the Greeks rejected it. When the Greeks in Italy and Albania also refused to accept the new name of "Purgatory," Innocent wrote in 1243 to Cardinal Otto: "Because they (the Greeks) say that a place for such a purgation has not been indicated to them by their Doctors by a fixed and special name, we decree that for the future it shall be known to them by this name (of Purgatory)" (*Innocent IV, Ep. 10, chapt. 23; Mansi, vol. 23, p. 582*).

The subject of Purgatory is too lengthy, and for brevity's sake we shall quote only a few statements by Roman Catholic scholars. It is true that some of the minor Fathers, influenced by paganism, believed in some kind of "cleansing fires" in the hereafter, but they were contradicted by other Fathers, and none of them believed in the Purgatory of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Roman Catholic Purgatory presupposes a Particular Judgment immediately after the death of each individual. After the General Judgment, Purgatory will cease to exist. The early Church of Rome and Africa (including Augustine and Pope Gregory) did not believe in a Private Judgment; neither does the Greek Orthodox Church of today.

Less than 200 years before the Reformation, Pope John XXII still denied the existence of a Particular Judgment and consequently that of Purgatory, by teaching that all souls departed sleep till the Day of Resurrection. "A number of theologians maintained the opinion that until the resurrection the just do not enjoy the intuitive or facial vision of God . . . Pope John XXII (1316-1334) at Avignon, as a private theologian, seems to have supported this view" (*Cath. Enc., vol. 8, p. 551*).

To save Papal infallibility (invented in 1870), Pope John is conveniently bisected into a theologian and a pope, as if out of one corner of his mouth he upheld the infallible teachings of his church, while out of the other corner he denied them "as a private theologian." When Roman scholars misquote some of the Fathers in favor of Purgatory, they always forget to mention that they are quoting opinions of private theologians.

Every prayer of the Requiem Mass and Funeral Mass denies the existence of Purgatory. The souls "rest" till the Last Judgment, and the priest beseeches God to spare the soul the pains of Hell. "Those who have opposed the doctrines of Purgatory," comments the Catholic Encyclopedia, "have confessed that

prayers for the dead would be an unanswerable argument if the *modern* doctrine of a 'particular judgment' had been received in the early ages" (*C. E.* 12, 576).

"Some of the early Fathers . . . believed that the essential beatitude of Heaven is not enjoyed UNTIL THE END OF TIME. They supposed that . . . the souls of the just dwell happily in a delightful abode, awaiting their final glorification. This was apparently the opinion of Sts. Justin and Irenaeus, Tertullian, St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Ambrose . . . Some of the Fathers contended that these souls do not suffer the torment of fire until reunited with their bodies in the resurrection . . . Until the question was settled by the decision of Benedict XII in 1332, there was MUCH UNCERTAINTY regarding the fate of the departed in the period between death and the general resurrection" (*Cath. Enc.* vol. 8, p. 551).

Tradition, therefore, is a poor rule of faith, even for Roman Catholics. We are merely examining the origin of Purgatory by quoting Roman theologians. "Clement may hold a purgatory, yet tend to consider all punishment (of Hades) purgatorial . . . St. Hilary may believe in a purgatory, yet confine it to the Day of Judgment . . . Prayers for the faithful departed may be found in the early liturgies, yet with an indistinctness which include the Blessed Virgin and the Martyrs in the same rank with the imperfect Christians . . . Thus we see, how, AS TIME WENT ON, the doctrine of Purgatory was brought home to the minds of the faithful as a portion or form of penance due for post-baptismal sin" (*Cardinal Newman, Development of Christian Doctrine*, p. 390).

The doctrine of Purgatory gradually developed in the West during the late Middle Ages. If my statements were "preposterous" (*Reply*, p. 36), it naturally follows that the scholars of the Catholic Encyclopedia and Cardinal Newman are "liars" too.

At the Council of Florence, 1439, which sought a merger of East and West, Roman Catholic Cardinal Bessarion was supposed to win the Greeks over to the new Western doctrine of Purgatory. When he failed, he argued that a merger could be effected with or without purgatory: "At the Council of Florence, Bessarion argued against the existence of real purgatorial fire, and the Greeks were assured that the Roman Church had never issued any dogmatic decree on the subject" (*C. E.* 12, 578).

If the existence of purgatorial fire is not a dogma (even the Council of Trent refused to decide the question), why are the monks peddling their "fire insurance"?

THE BIBLE A FORBIDDEN BOOK

I never have stated at any time that Roman Catholics are forbidden to read the Bible (*Reply*, p. 8). I stated that in the Middle Ages the Bible was a forbidden book, and that today the Roman churches are still without Bible classes. They may study Bible history, but not the exegesis of the text.

The Council of Toulouse (1229) did not only forbid the reading of faulty translations, but simply decreed: "We forbid the laity to possess the books of the Old and New Testament." Even the Vulgate of Jerome was forbidden reading, except the Psalms, if read in Latin. If the library of the Seminary of La Crosse cannot afford the volumes of Mansi on the Councils, read Prof. Lea's volumes on the "History of the Inquisition."

The Councils of Valencia and Toledo of that same year decreed the same. The Council of Tarragona (1234) decreed: "Anyone who has copies, must within eight days of this publication, hand them over to the Bishop to be burned." Just before the Reformation the Archbishop of Mainz, Germany, ridiculed to no end the "women and the lower classes" for thinking that they could read and understand the Bible, and he excommunicated anyone who bought or sold a Bible.

With regard to the statements that I studied the Scriptures "at the Dominican House of Studies" (*Reply*, p. 6), may I inform you that in my days Albertinum was just a Hotel for priest-students. No classes were conducted there. Even if I had studied for six years the subjects listed, I would have studied the exegesis of only 5 of the 27 books of the New Testament.

MARIOLOGY

I made the statement that a French Cardinal (Cardinal Em-

manuel Suhard, Archbishop of Paris) warned his Church not to make a goddess of Mary. The Cardinal complained that "Mary has become everything" and "Jesus and the Holy Trinity totally ignored." I have been told that even the paper of the Diocese of Cleveland, Ohio, the "Catholic Universe Bulletin," of March 3, 1949, carried excerpts from this famous warning. However, I did not want to bore my audience with French names; I did not name the Cardinal. I'm sorry, it was Cardinal Emmanuel Suhard.

The Reply of the priests of La Crosse states: "Again, this purveyor of falsehood fails to name the Cardinal . . . He knows he is lying, and no such statement was ever made by any Roman Catholic Prelate" (*Reply* p. 41).

JESUIT vs. DOMINICANS

The differences between Martin Luther and Calvin, between the Lutheran churches and the Reformed churches, is nothing new. Both schools of thought existed side by side within the Roman Church for at least 1000 years before the Reformation.

If private interpretation of the Bible created these divisions, then it follows that they were created by the private interpretations of the Fathers whose authority the Council of Trent (1546, Session 4) declared on equal footing with the Word of God. Augustine and Luther both denied Transubstantiation; Chrysostom and Calvin both denied the Sacrament of Penance. How ridiculous to accuse one of the sin of private interpretation and not the other; to call one a heretic and the other a saint. It does not seem to matter what they taught, but when and where they taught it.

Salvation is by faith through grace, and not by theology. When Lutherans and Presbyterians differ in some theological matters, non-essential to salvation, Rome ridicules their division. When Jesuits and Dominicans differ in matters of theology, Rome claims: "There is no doctrinal difference whatever" (*Reply* p. 27).

Luther and Calvin were both sincere, but the Jesuits were not, as is evident from their writings. Every historian knows that the early church preached salvation by grace (free gift of God), and that the medieval church amassed her wealth by preaching

salvation by works. This is what Mr. Lopez, the founder of the Jesuit Order, has to say on the subject:

"It must also be borne in mind, that, ALTHOUGH IT IS MOST TRUE THAT NO ONE IS SAVED UNLESS HE IS PREDESTINATED, nevertheless we must speak with circumspection about this subject, because by stressing too much the grace or predestination of God, we should perhaps appear as willing to deny the force of free will and the merits of good works . . . For this same reason we should not speak TOO OFTEN on this subject. When we do speak on it, we ought so TO TEMPER with what we say as to give the people who listen no occasion of erring and saying: 'If my salvation or damnation is already decreed, then my good or evil actions are predetermined.' Consequently many will neglect their good works" (*Ignatius Loyola, Spiritual Exercises, II, 14-15*).

EASTERN RITES

In my lectures I have often pointed out the differences of belief and practice between Eastern and Western rites within the Roman Church. The Uniats or Eastern Roman Catholics do NOT believe in (1) statues, (2) celibacy of priests, (3) baptism by pouring, (4) withholding of the wine from the laity, etc.

The La Crosse "Reply" calls my remarks "slandering" (p. 24), and concludes that "it is not correct then, to say that the 'cup has been kept from the Western Catholics'" (p. 25).

Just because a dispensation was once granted to a few High School students of Eau Claire to receive communion under both kinds, it does not follow that the cup is not withheld from the Roman Catholic people as a whole.

The Council of Constance (1415) and later Trent (1545) condemned the use of the cup. The Catholic Encyclopedia explains: "Not only, therefore, is Communion under both kinds NOT OBLIGATORY on the faithful, but the chalice is STRICTLY FORBIDDEN" (*C. E. vol. 4, p. 175*).

The Bohemian priest, John Huss (1414), defended the use of the cup, because (1) the command of Christ is obligatory: "Drink YE ALL of it" (*Matt. 26:27*), (2) Pope Gelasius, like

Pope Leo, had decreed by canon law that the withholding of the cup constitutes sacrilege (*Migne, P.L. 54, 280*), (3) the reception of both kinds had been the tradition of the Holy Church for 1,400 years, (4) Pope John XXIII, who initiated the withholding, was not worthy to be called a pope, was dethroned by General Council, and has been depapalized posthumously.

"Millions of Catholic Uniates receive both kinds," explains Father Fortescue. "Our practice is not CATHOLIC, but LATIN" (*Fortescue, The Mass, p. 377*). Yet the Slavic (Eastern) priest, John Huss, and hundreds of non-Latin Bohemians were murdered for refusing to introduce this new, unscriptural, non-Catholic custom.

The fact that a few Eastern Uniats in the United States are adopting a few Western customs does not prove that my statements are not true in general. I know that some Eastern priests are anxious to collect stipends for their prayers ("piety for money"). "The Uniats SOMETIMES copy the Latin multitude of altars in one church" (*C.E. 4, 316*). "Among the Greek Uniats the Rosary is but little used by the laity" (*C.E. 13, 188*).

As the average Eastern priest does not pray souls out of the flames of purgatory, but merely commemorates the dead awaiting the Day of Resurrection; as the average Uniat priest believes in the Epiklesis and does not believe that he has the consecration or transubstantiation power of the Western priest, the Catholic Encyclopedia warns that "It is a mistake . . . to speak of ANY Eastern liturgy as a Mass" (*C.E. 9, 792*).

There exists a secret law that any Greek Orthodox Christian can turn Roman Catholic (Uniat) by simply accepting the Bishop of Rome as Head of the Universal Church. He may retain all his Greek Orthodox beliefs and practices, as long as he does not attack Western beliefs. The Uniat is not subject to Canon Law. There are no publicly approved laws for the Eastern Rites as a whole. Let us briefly demonstrate this situation:

When the Council of Florence (1439) failed to effect a merger between East and West, the Council lost its temper and anathemized all Easterners: "The Roman Church firmly believes, professes and teaches that no one living outside the Catholic church—not only Pagans, but neither Jews, nor Heretics, nor SCHISMATICS—is capable of becoming a partaker of eternal life,

but will be condemned to the eternal fires" (*see also Canon 2314*).

Schism refers to ecclesiastical government, Heresy to ecclesiastical doctrine. The Greek Orthodox Christians are no longer Schismatics but Heretics, since Rome has made Purgatory, Papal Infallibility, Immaculate Conception, etc., dogmas of faith.

When attacking Protestantism or the beliefs of the Greek Orthodox Church, Roman theologians make it plain that both groups reject the same Roman Catholic dogmas: "The modern Orthodox Church denies Purgatory" (*Cath. Enc.*, vol. 12, p. 576), "rejects the Papal Infallibility, and the Papal Supremacy, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception" (*C.E.* 6, 753).

But when the Vatican has in mind a possible merger of East and West, and dreams of imposing her papal tax system (Peters-pence) on the entire world, all Roman dogmas are at once minimized as being just Latin customs of little importance:

"Celibacy, azyme bread, and so on, are LATIN CUSTOMS that no one thinks of forcing them. They need not add the Filioque to the Creed; they will ALWAYS keep their venerable rite untouched. Not a bishop need be moved, hardly a feast (except that of St. Photius on 6 Feb.) altered. ALL that is asked of them is TO COME BACK . . . There is not really ANY question of DOCTRINE involved. It is NOT HERESY, BUT A SCHISM" (*Cath. Enc.*, vol. 13, p. 538).

On Aug. 6th, 1955, the Associated Press quoted the present Pope as fully agreeing to this arrangement: "In reality the people of the East have nothing to fear from a reunion with the ROMAN CHURCH . . . ABSOLUTELY NOTHING would be taken away from the divinity and splendor of their holy rites NOR FROM THE SACRED HERITAGE given them by their Fathers" (*Vatican City, AP*, 8-6-55).

If this does not prove that the Vatican Hierarchy is a purely political system without principles of any kind, then no written confession can ever be produced as evidence of anything. The Roman Inquisition has murdered thousands of "heretics" for believing and following the sacred heritage of their Fathers. What constitutes heresy in the West seems to be quite permissible in the East. One naturally wonders under which conditions Rome is willing to merge with the Protestant bodies.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND ITS TRAIN OF INVENTIONS

I never stated that transubstantiation was invented by Thomas Aquinas (*Reply*, p. 31), and any Roman scholar who has read the books of Justin, Irenaeus, Cyril, etc., will agree with me that none of them wrote "on the dogma of transubstantiation." Rome adopted the French doctrine of transubstantiation in the 13th century, and Aquinas perfected its definition.

The Reply argues: "One ceremony alone of the Mass disproves Doeswyck's statement: 'The custom of the elevation of the Host after the consecration dates from the ELEVENTH CENTURY' (*Catechism of Liturgy*, p. 13)."

I am not interested in Catechisms. However, since the writer understands the connection between transubstantiation and Host-worship, we shall approach the subject from that angle. Students of Roman doctrine use exclusively original sources. Every ritual Rome has used from the 8th century on has survived, and Father Migne has reprinted them up to the 13th century. Considering the scholarship of my attackers, I better quote from recognized Roman Catholic authorities.

The Eucharistic controversies of the 9th and 11th century were not about transubstantiation, but about spiritual or real presence (a Protestant issue). Hildebert invented transubstantiation at the very end of the 11th century. France adopted it in the 12th century, and Rome adopted it in the 13th century. "It was Hildebert of Lavardin . . . who first used the word 'transubstantiation'" (*Catholic Enc.*, vol. 2, p. 488).

Peter Lombard (d. 1164), Archbishop of Paris and leading scholar, accepted only a "change" within the elements, but whether this change is formal or substantial, writes the Archbishop, "I am not able to define" (*Migne, P.L.* 192, 521).

Pope Innocent III in the Council of 1215 (canon 1) did not define transubstantiation, but merely used the word "transubstantiated." As late as the 14th century the world famous Bishop Durandus denied it and taught that "Christ could be present in the Eucharist with the substance of bread and wine remaining" (*C.E.* 5, 208).

ELEVATION: "The elevation of the Host was introduced in the early years of the THIRTEENTH CENTURY" (*C.E.* 2, 465). "It

is a late medieval ceremony. Till about the 12th century there is no trace of it . . . It began in France and was adopted at Rome rather LATER. By the 14th century it is established in the Roman Ordo (Roman Ritual)" (*Father Fortescue, The Mass*, p. 338). "A rite unknown till the 12th century cannot be of first importance in any liturgy" (*Fortescue, Mass*, p. 345). I wish that Roman scholars would apply this last truism to all Roman inventions.

BELLS: "It was apparently this desire to see the elevation that caused the custom of ringing the bell" (*Fortescue, Mass*, p. 342).

EUCCHARISTIC PROCESSIONS: "Under the influence of this idea (Elevation) the Blessed Sacrament in the Processions . . . became common AFTER the institution of the Feast of CORPUS CHRISTI in 1246" (*C.E.* 2, 466).

BENEDICTION: "In the FOURTEENTH CENTURY the practice of the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament arose" (*C.E.* 5, 581).

MONSTRANCE: "In the inventories of the 13th century they are seldom or NEVER (*which?*) mentioned, but in the FIFTEENTH CENTURY they have become a feature in all LARGER churches" (*C.E.* 11, 345).

TABERNACLE: "From the SIXTEENTH CENTURY it became GRADUALLY, although slowly, more customary to preserve the Blessed Sacrament in a receptacle that rose above the altar table. This was the case above all at Rome where the CUSTOM came into use . . . influenced largely by the good example set by St. Charles Borromeo (d. 1584)" (*C.E.* 14, 424). Not until the 19th century did the use of tabernacles become universal.

GENUFLECTIONS: "Genuflections of the CELEBRANT before and after each elevation came LATER . . . The genuflection did not become part of the rite, at any rate officially, till it was commanded in the Missal of 1570" (*Fortescue, Mass*, p. 341). The laity did not genuflect until the Congregation of Rites in 1876 decreed "that women as well as men must genuflect before the Blessed Sacrament" (*C.E.* 6, 427). One hundred years ago, most

churches in the United States had neither tabernacles nor kneeling benches. If Transubstantiation, Permanent Presence, and Host-worship had been taught by Peter, why did we not hear about it in the writings of the Fathers or in the minutes of the Councils? Why did it come so late? And if it did come late, as the Roman scholars confess, what is meant by the saying: "Rome never changes" (*semper eadem*)?

KISSING OF POPE'S FEET

The Reply wants us to believe that the kissing of the pope's feet is a thing of the remote past, a "feudal ceremonial" (p. 39), and in proof of it it quotes Luce's Time Magazine as an authority on liturgy. When the pope, as a good politician, has to shake hands with hundreds of tourists of all faiths, he naturally has to dispense with some of the liturgical formalities. At the seminary we had to memorize that (1) lay people kiss the pope's feet, (2) bishops and archbishops may kiss a little higher: the foot and knee, (3) the Cardinals kiss the foot and hand, (4) kings and emperors the hand only. The memorizing of this liturgical idolatry is called "theology," the study of God. This custom has not been abolished. "The kissing of the pope's foot," explains the Catholic Encyclopedia, is "the characteristic act of reverence by which ALL the faithful do honour to him as the vicar of Christ" (*C.E.* 12, 270).

Christ did not demand such worship for Himself, but washed the feet of His disciples. Peter explicitly forbade this act of worship (*Acts* 10:26). The pope claims to be the successor and vicar of both. He certainly did not inherit Peter's humility.

PAPAL TIARA

The Reply states that my evaluation of the papal crown is totally "untrue" and that the jewels of the crown "are comparatively worthless" (p. 39).

The pre-reformation pope, Julius II, "had a tiara valued at 200,000 ducats" (*C.E.* 14, 715). The encyclopedia does not speak of sentimental value. Clement VIII (d. 1605) added so many

jewels that the crown became worth more than 500,000 pieces of gold. Today the crown is valued at \$3,000,000. The only crown mentioned in the Bible is one of thorns: "My kingdom is not of this world" (*John 18:36*).

BIBLE VS. ROME

"Doeswyck cannot quote one practice of the Catholic Church that is in opposition of the Bible," maintains the Reply (p. 11). I have mentioned many, but the Reply did not refute them.

The recitation of the Rosary; the repetition of man-made prayers over the radio, at funerals, in churches; the counting of beads as punishment for sin, is a practice which Rome adopted from the Mohammedans. Christ warns: "When you pray, use not vain repetitions like the heathen, for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking" (*Matt. 6:7*).

Rome teaches that Mary is the Mediatrix, the Door of Heaven (*porta coeli*), the refuge of sinners, the dispenser of ALL graces. Christ says: "I am the door" (*John 10:9*). "No one cometh unto the Father, but through Me" (*John 14:6*). "There is one mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ" (*1 Tim. 2:5*).

Rome claims that it has the power to forbid her clergy to marry. The Bible says that a Bishop or Deacon must be "the husband of one wife" (*1 Tim. 3:2 and 12*), and speaks about the children of bishops and their wives (*verses 4 and 11*). "Forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meat," warns the same Epistle, are "doctrines of devils" (*1 Tim. 4:1-3*).

The making of statues in order to kneel and pray before them, is forbidden by the Commandments of God. Even the altars, Masses, and religious services of "Saint" Michael are contrary to God's Word "Let no man beguile you . . . into worshipping of Angels" (*Col. 2:18*).

These Roman practices and numerous others which I have mentioned in my lectures are not only contrary to the Bible but contrary to the Fathers, Councils, and traditions of the early Church.

MISQUOTATIONS AND DISTORTIONS

There are charges in the Reply which do not merit an answer.

I never said that I spoke at Notre Dame (*Reply*, p. 45). I mentioned long ago that I spoke at Princeton, Cornell and many other universities. I also mentioned three years ago in Iowa that I had spoken over the radio of Mishawaka, Ind., less than 10 miles from Notre Dame University (May 3, 1953). My statements have been twisted to discredit my character.

I never made the statement that "I know (personally) thousands of priests" who are locked up in monasteries (*Reply* p. 45). I have stated that we know that some thousand priests are locked up. These priests are listed in the Catholic Directory under each diocese under the false heading of "on sick leave." Those who are listed without addresses, are locked up.

The insinuation that I do not believe in the divinity of Christ (*Reply*, p. 45) is harmless to the thousands who have heard me, but may have been thrown in to confuse Roman Catholics.

With regard to Luther's writings, Roman Catholics will understand that some were written before his conversion, while his much quoted Table Talks are "apocryphal." A man should not be judged by what others wrote after his death.

In Spencer, Ia., I did not speak in the church of Rev. Drew (*Reply*, p. 43), but in the Episcopalian Church, while Rev. Droog of the Reformed church presided.

ORDINATION OF WOMEN

Underestimating the power of a woman, the Reply attacks "the ordination of women" (p. 12), and gives an interesting interpretation of I Cor. 14:34: "Let women keep silence in the churches." The author does not seem to know that in his own church the "Carthusian nuns" are ordained Deacons and Subdeacons, and vested with "stole and maniple," they chant Solemn Masses, singing souls out of Purgatory (*See Cath. Enc.*, vol. 3, p. 391-392).

NOVENAS

Novenas (devotions in honor of a Saint, in nine consecutive weeks), Communion on nine consecutive First Fridays of the

month, etc., are late Roman Catholic practices based on the numerical superstition of the lucky number "9."

I have stated that in the days of the Reformation the Roman Catholic Church did not have devotions, called "Novenas." The Reply maintains that "There were novenas in France, Belgium and the Lower Rhine long before the year 1000" (p. 38).

Of course, there were Novenas long before Christianity. They are pagan (*Livy I, 31*), and the Fathers, like Augustine, warned the Christians not to imitate them (*Migne, P.L. 34, 596*). "Long before the year 1000," the Low Countries were still pagan; and when freshly converted from paganism, we find some instances there of belief in novenas and other pagan practices. The Roman Catholic Church did not come into existence till the Schism of 1054. The Reply fails to mention that the Roman Catholic theologians, like Belet, Gerson, etc., immediately condemned these pagan practices, and Bishop Durandus (14th cent.) informs us that all Roman Catholic theologians of his day condemned Novenas as outright pagan superstitions. The Catholic Encyclopedia is more honest than the Reply: "Not until the NINETEENTH CENTURY did the Church formally recommend novenas" (*Cath. Enc., vol. 11, p. 143*). Even this statement is only partly true, because the Roman Ritual does not recognize the Novena as official Roman liturgy.

BLESSED MEDALS

The Reply quotes me as having said: "Martin Luther had never seen a medal" (p. 37). Of course, medals are older than Christianity, and the wearing of them is an old pagan superstition, condemned by the Fathers and Councils of the early church. But I spoke on the "Blessed Medals" of the Roman Catholic Church, which are called "Sacramentals" and which supposedly produce grace *ex opere operantis*. Such medals were unknown to Martin Luther.

Martin Luther died in 1546. The Catholic Encyclopedia states that: "The use of blessed medals began with the revolt of the Gueux in Flanders, A.D. 1566" (*C.E. vol. 10, p. 114*). Hence Luther missed the grace of medals by 20 years.

As Roman Indulgences were occasioned by the Turks, Roman Catholic Medals were occasioned by the crusades against the

Protestants. "Among the benediction-forms of the Middle Ages no single example is found of a blessing for numismata" (*C.E.* 10, 111-114). The first Catholic medals were not always blessed by the priest, were not known as Sacramentals, and were worn only by special groups. It was not until the 19th century, after the alleged apparition of Mary to Catherine in Paris, 1830, that the Roman Catholic people as a whole began to wear blessed medals around their necks.

BLESSED SCAPULARS

I spoke on Blessed Scapulars, two small pieces of cloth, a Sacramental worn by the Roman Catholic people, blessed by the priest and guaranteeing grace. I did not speak on a monk's garment by the same name.

The Reply considers the remarks "insulting" (p. 40). Maybe they are. Judge for yourself.

The Carmelite Scapular (shoulder-garment), a full length garment of a monk, was invented in the 15th century and falsely attributed to Simon Stock of the 13th century. The Catholic Encyclopedia, under the heading of the *Sabbatine Privilege* (another Carmelite fraud, *C.E.* 13, 290), frankly admits that the alleged *rendezvous* between Mary and Simon Stock never took place, that the Papal Bull "Sacratissimo uti culmine" of Pope John XXII in 1322 is also a Carmelite forgery (Pope John did not believe in a Particular Judgment, nor in Purgatory). and that the Carmelite Scapular could not have existed prior to the year 1379 (14th cent.). Before quoting the Catholic Encyclopedia I wish to inform my readers that among Roman scholars the expression "pious tradition" is a euphemism for an outright fraud of the hierarchy, piously believed by the unlearned.

"According to a PIOUS TRADITION the Blessed Virgin appeared to Simon Stock at Cambridge, England, on Sunday, 16 July, 1251 . . . and said: 'Take, beloved son, this scapular of thy order as a badge of My confraternity . . . whosoever dies in this garment will not suffer everlasting fire' (*C.E.* 13, 511). 'The Mother of God appeared to Simon Stock with the scapular of the order in her hand. This scapular she gave him with the words: 'Hoc tibi . . . This shall be the privilege for you and for all Carmelites, that anyone dying in this habit shall be saved'

(*C.E.* 13, 800). "In the rules of the religious it is expressly prescribed under penalties that even at night the scapular must be worn" (*C.E.* 13, 508).

Naturally these scapulars were very soiled and dirty. Such remarks may be insulting, but are historical and physiological facts. The pity of it, however, is the biblical fact that salvation is by faith and not by garments.

After the Reformation, the Carmelite monks allowed their Confraternities (half layman, half monk) to wear scapulars of smaller sizes. By the 19th century all laymen could be enrolled by wearing tiny scapulars and sharing the same indulgences. "The history of the origin of the first four small scapulars is still to a great extent **OBSCURE**. It is **PROBABLE** that . . . the **SIXTEENTH CENTURY** (the Counter-Reformation) gave the chief impetus to the development of the scapulars" (*C.E.* 13, 510). "Whoever, therefore, even though he be now a sinner, wears the badge of the Mother of God . . . Mary will . . . procure for him all the necessary graces for true conversion and for perseverance" (*C.E.* 13, 511).

Like the Blessed Medal, the Blessed Scapular, as a sacramental for the laity, originated after the Reformation, first for privileged groups and by the 19th century for all laymen. The Scapular of the Immaculate Heart of Mary originated in 1877, and in 1900 the Scapular of the Sacred Heart of Jesus was approved (as an afterthought). Because of American opposition to dirty pieces of cloth, the pope granted in 1910 the remarkable dispensation of wearing a piece of metal instead. Older people, especially in Europe, still wear the pieces of cloth: "Quite recently Pius X has sanctioned the use of a blessed medal to be worn in place of the brown and other scapulars" (*C.E.* 10, 115).

The Sabbatine Privilege of the Scapular, is an additional indulgence granted to the wearer, but its origin is also based on fraud. "By this privilege the Blessed Virgin will release from Purgatory on the first Saturday after his death, any wearer of the scapular . . ." (*Cath. Dict., Paulist Fathers*, p. 45). Pope John XXII, who supposedly granted this indulgence, did not believe in Purgatory.

ROSARY

The Rosary is another fraud, invented in the 15th century by the Dominican Preacher, Alain de Rupe (A.D. 1460), who falsely attributed its origin to St. Dominic (A.D. 1212). A famous Jesuit scholar has exposed the Dominican fraud in the Catholic Encyclopedia (*C.E.* 13, 186).

In spite of all guarantees by Papal Bulls, Rituals and prayer books, the learned Jesuit proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that Mary never appeared to St. Dominic and never gave him a rosary.

The name "Rosary", like the "Mysteries" of the rosary, originated in the 15th century, at the time when the "Hail Mary" ended with the words: "the fruit of thy womb, Amen." The "Holy Mary" was invented after the Reformation.

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION (1854)

The Reply maintains that "there is a long and impressive array of quotations from the Fathers on Mary's Immaculate Conception" (p. 41), but fails to mention any. There are none!

I have before me a manuscript which I compiled from the Fathers on the subject of Mary's conception and original sin. Space does not permit me to list all sources, volumes and pages of Migne.

During the first four centuries every Father without exception not only denied Mary's exemption from original sin, but even from actual sins, for example: Ireneaus (d. 202), Tertullian (d. 230), Origen (d. 254), Hilary (d. 367), Basil (d. 379), Ephiphanius (d. 402), Chrysostom (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), Cyril (d. 444).

After the introduction of the word "theotokos" (God-bearer) in the 4th century until the 12th century the Fathers taught that Mary had remained free from actual sin, but not from original sin. Not only the Fathers, but the greatest of Roman popes denied the Immaculate Conception: Pope Leo the Great in 446 (*Migne, P.L.* 54, 211), Pope Gelasius in 492 (*Migne, P.L.* 59, 117-118), Pope Gregory the Great in 600, etc. As late as the 13th century,

Pope Innocent III (1215) wrote: "The first woman (Eve) was brought forth without sin, but she herself brought forth in sin; the second woman (Mary) was BROUGHT FORTH IN SIN, but brought forth without sin" (*Migne, P.L., vol. 217, p. 581*). Father Migne innocently comments: "Pope Innocent III could hold this opinion in a matter not yet defined by the Church" (*p. 581*).

The first heresy arose in the 12th century when the Diocese of Lyons, France, changed the feast of "The Conception of Ann" into "The Conception of Mary," and began to teach that not only Christ, but Mary also had been conceived of a virgin. St. Bernard in strong language warned the Canons of Lyons: "not to introduce a new feast, which is foreign to the Ritual of the Church, which cannot be proved from reason, and which is contrary to ancient tradition. We should not pretend to be wiser or to be holier than the Fathers" (*Migne, P.L., vol. 182, p. 333*).

St. Bernard says that this new doctrine was unknown to the Fathers, but the priests of La Crosse claim to have an "impressive array of quotations from the Fathers," and evidently they can prove that St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers, was a 'liar' himself. St. Bernard explained to the priests of Lyons: "She gave birth as a virgin, but she herself was not born of a virgin" (*p. 335*). The heresy was suppressed and did not rise again till the 14th century.

Not only Pope Innocent III (13th cent.) denied the Immaculate Conception, but all the great theologians of that era: St. Anselm, Peter Lombard, Peter Blois, St. Thomas Aquinas, Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure, etc.

The Dominican monks had taken over the reign from the Benedictines in the 13th century, headed the Inquisition against heresy, and ran the Western Church till the Reformation. The Dominicans ruled till the last that the Immaculate Conception was a heresy.

When in the 14th century the Franciscan monks succeeded in driving the Dominicans out of the universities of France, they revived in France the heresy of the Immaculate Conception. The Dominicans suppressed the heresy. Of course, the very word "heresy" implies that the opposite view existed. Martin Luther was not a Dominican monk. The fact that his sermon on the feast of the "Conception of Mary" leaned towards the Franciscan view does not prove that the Dominicans did not call this

view heretical.

In the days of the Reformation Cardinal Cajetan (d. 1534), the great Italian Dominican scholar who opposed Luther, and Bishop Melchior, the great Spanish scholar and delegate to the Council of Trent (1545), opposed the Franciscan Order which had begun to press Rome for the canonization of their new doctrine. In the days of the Council of Trent Bishop Melchior warned:

"The doctrine which holds that the Blessed Virgin was free from original sin is nowhere delivered in the Scriptures . . . Nor can it be said that this doctrine has descended into the Church by 'apostolic tradition,' for traditions of this kind cannot have come to us through any other persons than by the ancient bishops and the holy writers who succeeded the Apostles. But it is evident that these ancient writers did not receive their doctrine from their predecessors" (*De Locis, Theol. M., I.*).

When the Council of Trent had to define its doctrine of Original Sin, it "assembled with the Holy Ghost," and declared that all men are conceived in the sin of Adam. Unable to overrule the Dominican views, and unwilling to offend the rich Franciscan Order, the Council of Trent (and the H. Ghost?) diplomatically confessed that it had no knowledge of a possible exception of Mary.

After the Reformation the Jesuits took over, and the Dominicans became a second class order. Saint Alphonsus de Liguori, as late as the 18th century taught that Mary could not have been conceived immaculately. The Dominicans taught the same. In 1854, Pope Pius IX, evidently better informed than the bishops of the Council of Trent, made it a dogma of faith, under pain of eternal damnation, that Mary was conceived without sin. Among others, the pope quoted the falsified text of Gen. 3:15 in proof of the new doctrine.

What does the Greek Orthodox Church have to say about this:

"The Orthodox Church is the Mother Church which till today keeps and spreads the doctrines of Christ unchanged as they were delivered to the Saints . . . The theory of the Immaculate Conception is based neither on Holy Scripture nor on Sacred Tradition. NONE OF THE FATHERS of the Undivided Church (prior to 1054) or any of its renowned theologians ever supported this theory" (*Bishop Athenagoras Kokkinakis, "Christian*

Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism," Los Angeles, 1952).

I merely repeated what all scholars say. If we have freedom of speech, I should be allowed to speak in a Protestant Church to Protestant people on a Protestant question.

The Roman Church received its doctrine of original sin from the African Church between the fourth and sixth centuries (C.E. 3, 431; 5, 78). A Church which at first was in the dark about the existence of Original Sin, now claims to know that Mary was exempt from it.

The Apostolic Church of Rome must have been better informed, for Paul wrote to Rome: "ALL have sinned and come short of the glory of God," "They are ALL under sin," There are no exemptions: "no, not one" (Rom. 3:9, 10, 12, 23).

ASSUMPTION OF MARY

The doctrine of the Assumption is a fraud, perpetrated in France at the end of the 6th century, adopted by Rome in the 7th, and sneaked into the Ritual by the 8th century.

"The belief in the bodily assumption of Mary, under the influence of the APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS, is older in Gaul than in Rome . . . The Feast of the Assumption, found in the Sacramentaries of Gelasius and Gregory, is a SPURIOUS addition" (*Cath. Enc., vol. 2, p. 6*).

When Europe became relic conscious, and began to dig up the bones of Martyrs, it was discovered that the grave of Mary, the Queen of Martyrs, was nowhere venerated. The embarrassment was easily solved by inventing the story of her ascension.

In the sixth century some French imposter, imitating the Gospel of John, forged an "inspired" writing under the title of "The Death of the Blessed Lady." Pretending to be an eye-witness to Mary's assumption into heaven, the French author attached the signature of the Apostle John to the forgery, thus creating a new, inspired and apostolic writing. Realizing that his fraud might easily be exposed by the silence of the Fathers on this subject the author mutilated the works of the Fathers, especially those of the famous 5th century Fathers, St. Jerome and St. Augustine, and fabricated in their names several false Epistles which ana-

chronistically make mention of his document. Such a calculated deception can only come from the headquarters of the French church. Rome admits the fraud as follows:

"The first six centuries did not know of the tomb of Mary at Jerusalem. The belief in the corporeal assumption of Mary is **FOUNDED** on the **APOCRYPHAL** treatise 'De Obitu S. Dominae,' bearing the name of St. JOHN . . . It is also found in the book 'De Transitu Virginis,' **FALSELY** attributed to St. Melito of Sardis; and in a **SPURIOUS** letter attributed to St. Denis . . . St. Gregory of Tours (De gloria mart. I, iv) mentions it first. The sermons of St. Jerome and St. Augustine for this feast, however, are **SPURIOUS**" (*Cath. Enc.*, vol. 2, p. 6).

Within these few lines five forgeries are mentioned which introduced the Assumption. If Bishop Gregory of Tours (593) was not the author of these forgeries, he was the first victim of them.

For six centuries Christianity flourished without the fraud and forgery of the Assumption, till a French Cleric, 123 years after the death of St. Patrick, revealed the forgery to the world. After the Reformation the Assumption-legend became more and more doubted. To prevent its total extinction, the present Pope made it a dogma of faith in 1950.

Roman Catholics should never forget that the greatest Roman Catholic scholars, who composed the Catholic Encyclopedia before the Assumption became a dogma, admit that the "belief" in the Assumption is based or "founded" on fraud and forgery.

"ROMAN CHURCH" AND "ROMAN PRIMACY"

In my lectures I have stated that till the sixth century the Bishop of Rome was the pastor of one church, with no jurisdiction over churches outside of Rome. The Reply (p. 20) denies this and quotes as proof from a Tourist Guide.

Roman scholars, however, admit that Rome had no hierarchy of any kind, but only a parochial system, till about the end of the 5th century. The first "churches" built in Rome were cemetery chapels in the suburbs. These churches were ministered by "assistant-Elders" (Cardinal-priests), who were allowed to bap-

tize, but forbidden to preside over the Lord's Supper.

All dates ascribed to the churches of the city of Rome are "apocryphal," taken from the *Liber Pontificalis* and other forgeries.

In 530, when Rome had outgrown its earlier parochial system, Pope Felix published the "*Liber Pontificalis*," a forgery. The Catholic Encyclopedia explains: "The compiler of the *Liber Pontificalis* utilizes also some historical writings, a number of APOCRYPHAL fragments (e.g., the PSEUDO-Clementine Recognitions), the *Constitutum Sylvestri* (another FORGERY), the SPURIOUS Acts of the ALLEGED Synod of 275 Bishops under Sylvester, etc. and the fifth century Roman Acts of Martyrs. Finally the compiler distributed arbitrarily along his list of popes a number of PAPAL DECREES taken from UNAUTHENTIC sources; he likewise ATTRIBUTED to earlier popes LITURGICAL AND DISCIPLINARY REGULATIONS of the sixth century" (*Cath. Enc.*, vol. 9, p. 225).

This *Liber Pontificalis*, a forgery itself, was further falsified in the 9th century by Pseudo-Isidore. Under the heading of "False Decretals" the Catholic Encyclopedia writes: "Nowadays everyone agrees that these so-called PAPAL LETTERS are FORGERIES . . . The Middle Ages were deceived by this HUGE FORGERY" (*C.E.* 5, 773).

This encyclopedia alone admits over 1000 Roman forgeries. Tourist Guides are still using these forgeries to lure "pilgrims" to their collection boxes.

What I said about the early church of Rome is common knowledge among scholars and admitted in the Catholic Encyclopedia under numerous headings, e.g., under Cardinals (*C.E.* vol. 3, pp. 333, 334) and under the names of the early popes. The alleged hierarchy which the *Liber Pontificalis* attributes to Pope Evaristus is a deliberate anachronism of "a later institution of the Roman Church" (*C.E.* 5, 646).

From the text of the seven Ecumenical Councils (325, 381, 431, 451, 553, 681, 787) we know that not one of these councils of the Church Universal was held at Rome; not one called together by the Bishop of Rome; not one presided over by the Bishop of Rome. As long as the Catholic Church was undivided, no bishop of Rome ever stated that he was the Head of the Universal Church. Pope Gregory the Great himself warns that anyone who dares to call himself the Bishop of the Universal

Church (Universalem Sacerdotem) is the forerunner of Antichrist (*Migne, P.L. 77, 891*). When Pope Leo (451) wrote to the Emperor, he limited his title of jurisdiction to the "City of Rome" (*Ep. 29*); and when the "Holy and Great and Universal Council" of Chalcedon (451) mailed copies of invitations to the bishops of the world, the letter which was mailed to Rome was addressed to "Archbishop Leo" (*Ep. 98.4; Migne, P.L. 54, 951*). Pope Adrian (787) explains in the text of the Seventh Ecumenical Council that the Church is founded on the FAITH which Peter confessed (*Mansi 12, 1057; Migne, P.L. 96, 1220*). Had either Leo or Adrian dared to say that the Church was founded on the bishop of Rome, and that they were the Head of the entire Church Universal, they would have been excommunicated at once.

The name "Roman Catholic Church" has never been uttered by anyone during the first thousand years of Christianity. It came into existence after the final Schism of East and West (1054). But Schism is the opposite of Catholicity. Once the Ecumenical church was split into East and West, neither half could claim to be the whole or universal church. The Eastern half realized this and called itself the Greek Orthodox Church, the Western half introduced the name Roman Catholic Church. Pope Nicholas II at the First Lateran Synod of 1059 is the first man to speak of *the Pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church* (*Romanae Universalis Ecclesiae; Monumenta German. Hist., Leges, Sect. 4, vol. 1, p. 539*). From this time on, Roman Catholic theologians begin to explain the petrine text (Matt. 16:18) as referring to the primacy of the Bishop of Rome.

Contrary to the assertions in the Reply (p. 21), no Father of the Church has ever interpreted the petrine text as referring to Roman supremacy. We need not look among the Greek Fathers and will quote only the greatest of the Western Fathers:

St. Jerome (d. 420): "The Rock is Christ" (*Migne, P.L. 25, 1066*). St. Augustine (d. 430): "For the Rock was Christ" (*P.L. 36, 724*); Pope St. Leo the Great (d. 461) teaches that the Church is "built on the impregnable Rock, Christ" (*P.L. 54, 207*); Pope St. Gregory the Great (d. 604) explains: "Christ is the foundation" (*P.L. 77, 1165*); St. Bede (d. 735): "on this Rock, which means, on the Saviour" (*P.L. 92, 78-79*); Rabanus, Archbishop of Mainz (856): "On the Lord Saviour . . . the

Church is built" (*P.L.* 107, 991); Paschasius Radbertus (9th cent.): "For Peter . . . is not the foundation . . . because no one can lay another foundation . . . which is Christ Jesus" (*Migne P.L.*, vol. 120, p. 560).

Protestants have not invented a new interpretation, but fully agree with the Fathers of the Church. Only modern Rome rejects both the Scriptures and the teachings of the Fathers.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY (1870)

"The doctrine of infallibility is as old as the Church," protests the Reply (p. 42). If so, the greatest Roman Catholic scholar on the Councils of the Church, Bishop Hefele, did not know it. Bishop Hefele, who wrote a work of seven volumes on the councils, risked his neck at the Vatican Council (May 17, 1870) by explaining and proving that none of the Fathers and Bishops who attended the Ecumenical Councils, had ever heard of papal infallibility (*Mansi, S. Concil.*, vol. 52, p. 80-84). Bishop Joseph Strossmayer delivered his immortal speech at the Vatican Council against papal infallibility, but Rome did not release the text till 1926 and now claims that his speech is apocryphal, and that the Bishops of the Council protested so loudly that he was unable to deliver it (*Mansi*, 51, 77). This explanation clashes with the remarks published in the Catholic Encyclopedia of 1907 (*C.E.* 14, 316).

Instead of two dissenting votes, as the Reply maintains, 83 Bishops and Archbishops voted against it, including the bishops of St. Louis, Mo., Cincinnati, Ohio, and St. Augustine, Fla. Bishop Strossmayer never accepted the new doctrine, but under pressure agreed to pretend "outwardly" that he abided by the decision.

It was in 1870 that the scholar, Dr. John Dollinger wrote his famous "The Pope and the Councils" under the pen name of "Janus." It was all in vain. The scholars lost out and the diplomats won. Up to 1870 the Bishops of the West still could overrule the pope. After 1870 the pope became the sole dictator in matters of both faith and morals.

"The Church was founded by our Lord and established

throughout the known world by His Apostles . . . For nine centuries the Church of the East and the West was united and governed in a DEMOCRATIC manner . . . Eventually . . . the Western Church was considered schismatic. Thus in 1054 communion between the East and West virtually ceased to exist. This separation gave the Western Church the freedom to add man-teachings and practices foreign to Christian tradition (Infallibility, Immaculate Conception, etc.) . . . the Western Church, which is DICTATORIAL or TOTALITARIAN in nature. The Church has no visible head, but only the Invisible One, Christ Himself" (*Bishop Athenagoras Kokkinakis, "Christian Orthodoxy," Los Angeles, 1952*).

CONCLUSION

The Church was founded in Jerusalem (*Luke 24:47; Acts 8:1*), and not in Rome. The foundation and cornerstone of the Church were laid in "Zion" (*Isaiah 28:16; I Peter 2:6; Rom. 9:33; Acts 4:12*), not in Italy. Christianity started in the East and spread to the West, not vice versa. Rome was the last of the national churches to be founded by the apostles (*Acts 28:30-31*).

To the early Christians it made no difference whether one belonged to the Church of Jerusalem, Rome or Constantinople; salvation is not by town but by faith (*Eph. 2:8*). It makes no difference whether we belong to a church established by Peter, or to a church established by Paul or Apollos (*I Cor. 3:4*), as long as we believe in Christ and are of Christ (*I Cor. 3:23*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH. There are many authors, but few scholars on the subject of Patrology. The great majority of quotations from the Fathers by Catholic authors are totally untrustworthy. When Father Conway, for example, cites Bishop Gregory of Bergamo as proof that "the" Seven Sacraments existed as early as the 12th century (Question Box, p. 234), a scholar immediately realizes that the man never read the Bishop's book, but merely copies from untrustworthy 'authorities.'

There are some good translations of the Ante-Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, but too many works are excluded. The new Roman Catholic translation of the Fathers is the most unscholarly of them all. By the use of free translations, the wrong choice of synonyms, and flowery language, they have succeeded in hiding the true meaning of the original text. Some of the most important books are purposely omitted.

The most reliable text of the Fathers in print, is that of the French priest-scholar, Father Migne, in 473 huge volumes:

MIGNE, J. P., "PATROLOGIAE LATINAE CURSUS," 225 vols.
"PATROLOGIAE GRECAE CURSUS," 248 vols.

The abbreviation: "Migne P.L. 4, 350," stands for "Latin Fathers, vol. 4, p. 350." Migne includes nearly all the works of the Fathers and theologians, up to the 13th century. His volumes can be found in Newberry Library of Chicago; New York Public Library; Union Theological Seminary, New York City (open to the public); University of Southern California, Los Angeles; and in many private libraries.

COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH. The last volume of the Post-Nicene Fathers has a good English translation of the Ecumenical Councils. The best known collection is that of John D. Mansi, an Italian Archbishop:

MANSI, J. D. "SACRORUM CONCILIORUM COLLECTIO," 58 vols.

Volumes 51 to 58 were published after 1925 in Arnheim, the Netherlands. These volumes can be obtained from the Newberry Library, Chicago; Library of USC; and, of course, from the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.



